



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/752,925

01/07/2004

William Reginald Pollard

99-0601

5784

40158

7590

01/24/2006

WOODS FULLER SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

ATTN: JEFFREY A. PROEHL

P.O. BOX 5027

SIOUX FALLS, SD 57117

EXAMINER

PREVIL, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2636

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/752,925

Applicant(s)

POLLARD, WILLIAM REGINALD

Examiner

Daniel Previl

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status:

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/7/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communication filed on November 03, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters (US 3,730,110).

Regarding claim 1, Peters discloses a cash register alarm system (abstract) comprising: a cash drawer having a back wall and a bottom wall (fig. 1); a tray having a bottom wall and a back wall and being removeably disposed upon bottom wall of cash drawer (fig. 1-fig. 2; col. 2, lines 8-38) tray further having a plurality of partitions spaced apart and forming compartments in tray (fig. 1-fig. 2; col. 2, lines 8-38); a plurality of sensors (fingers 20-20d) (fig. 2) disposed in compartments for detecting the presence of paper money in compartments (col. 2, lines 8-25); a plurality of electrical current contact members disposed upon back wall of tray and upon back wall of cash drawer (power source, switch) (fig. 8; col. 3, lines 57-67; col. 4, lines 1-6 and lines 20-22).

Peters discloses all the limitations above but fails to disclose each sensor of plurality of sensors is a light sensitive detector actuated when sensor is exposed to light; wherein each sensor of plurality of sensors is mounted on bottom wall of compartment of tray such that placement of paper money in compartment blocks light from reaching sensor and removal of paper money from the compartment exposes sensor to light.

However, Dagle discloses each sensor of plurality of sensors is a light sensitive detector actuated when sensor is exposed to light; wherein each sensor of plurality of sensors is mounted on bottom wall of compartment of tray such that placement of paper money in compartment blocks light from reaching sensor and removal of paper money from the compartment exposes sensor to light (fig. 1-fig. 8; col. 3, lines 45-75; col. 4, lines 8-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Dagle's plurality of sensors in Peters. Doing so would detect accurately the removal of the entire stack of bills by a teller in response to the demand of a bank robber thereby triggering an alarm to apprise security of the existence of the emergency so preventing unauthorized removal of the contents of the drawer as taught by Dagle (abstract).

Regarding claim 2, Peters discloses electrical current contact members disposed upon tray are connected to sensors with wires (fig. 3-fig. 8; col. 3, lines 18-32).

Regarding claim 3, Peters discloses electrical current contact members disposed upon cash drawer are connected to the alarm system (spray mechanism) with wires (fig. 3-fig. 8, col. 3, lines 18-32).

Regarding claim 4, Peters discloses electrical current contact members of tray is in contactable relationship with a respective one of electrical contact members of cash drawer (fig. 3-fig. 8, col. 3, lines 55-66).

Regarding claim 5, Peters discloses sensors are connected to one another in series such that more than one of sensors would need to be actuated before electrical impulse would be transmitted to the alarm system (fig. 2; col. 3, lines 24-32).

Regarding claim 7, Peters discloses all the limitations in claim 1 but fails to explicitly disclose sensors are essentially light sensitive detectors which are actuated when they are exposed to light.

However, Dagle discloses a plurality of photocells 50, 52, 74, 76, 86, 88 which are triggered when exposed to ambient light (col. 4, lines 8-17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Dagle's photocell in Peters. Doing so would modify Peter's system with Dagle's photocell in order to prevent accurately the unauthorized opening of the cash drawer thereby ensuring the safety of the system against theft as taught by Dagle (abstract).

Regarding claims 8-9, Peters and Dagle disclose all the limitations in claim 1 but fail to specify that electrical current contact members of tray are disposed

on an exterior or interior of back wall thereof; Since Peters discloses that the circuit arrangement with current source 92 and switches 94, 96 are located at an inconspicuous place on the cash drawer (col. 3, lines 55-63). So, it would have been obvious to any skill artisan at the time the invention was made to place the circuit arrangement on an exterior of back wall in order to conceal the electrical members from malicious people thereby preventing unauthorized removal of the contents of the drawer as taught by Peters (col. 3, line 67, col. 4, line 1).

3. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters and Dagle.

Regarding claim 10, Peters discloses a cash register alarm system (abstract) comprising: a cash drawer having a back wall and a bottom wall (fig. 1); a tray having a bottom wall and a back wall and being removeably disposed upon bottom wall of cash drawer (fig. 1-fig. 2; col. 2, lines 8-38) tray further having a plurality of partitions spaced apart and forming compartments in tray (fig. 1-fig. 2; col. 2, lines 8-38); a plurality of sensors (fingers 20-20d) (fig. 2) disposed in compartments for detecting the presence of paper money in compartment (col. 2, lines 8-25); a plurality of electrical current contact members (power source, switch) (fig. 8); electrical current contact members disposed upon tray are connected to sensors with wires (fig. 3-fig. 8; col. 3, lines 18-32); electrical current contact members disposed upon cash drawer are connected to the alarm system (spray mechanism) with wires (fig. 3-fig. 8, col. 3, lines 18-32);

electrical current contact members of tray is in contactable relationship with a respective one of electrical contact members of cash drawer (fig. 3-fig. 8, col. 3, lines 55-66); sensors are connected to one another in series such that more than one of sensors would need to be actuated before electrical impulse would be transmitted to the alarm system (fig. 2; col. 3, lines 24-32); each of electrical current contact members of cash drawer being aligned and in contactable relationship with a respective one of electrical current contact members of tray so that the alarm system is connected to sensors (fig. 1-fig.8; col. 3, lines 10-67).

Peters discloses all the limitations above but fails to explicitly disclose each sensor of plurality of sensors is a light sensitive detector actuated when sensor is exposed to light, each sensor of plurality of sensors is mounted on bottom wall of compartment of tray such that placement of paper money in compartment blocks light from reaching sensor and removal of paper money from the compartment exposes sensor to light, light-sensitive detectors being interconnected with wires, electrical current contact members of tray being disposed on an exterior of back wall, electrical current contact members being disposed on an interior of back wall.

However, Dagle discloses each sensor of plurality of sensors is a light sensitive detector actuated when sensor is exposed to light; wherein each sensor of plurality of sensors is mounted on bottom wall of compartment of tray such that placement of paper money in compartment blocks light from reaching sensor and removal of paper money from the compartment exposes sensor to light, light-

sensitive detectors being interconnected with wires (fig. 1-fig. 8; col. 3, lines 45-75; col. 4, lines 8-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Dagle's plurality of sensors in Peters. Doing so would detect accurately the removal of the entire stack of bills by a teller in response to the demand of a bank robber thereby triggering an alarm to apprise security of the existence of the emergency so preventing unauthorized removal of the contents of the drawer as taught by Dagle (abstract).

Moreover, Peters and Dagle disclose all the limitations above but fails to specify that plurality of electrical members disposed on an exterior and interior back wall of tray and upon back wall of cash drawer. Since, Peters discloses a circuit arrangement having a current source 92 and switches 94, 96 place on the cash register (fig. 8, col. 3, lines 57-63). It would have been obvious to any skill artisan at the time the invention was made to place the circuit arrangement which is the electrical members on exterior and interior back wall of the tray and back wall of cash drawer in order to conceal the electrical members from malicious people thereby preventing unauthorized removal of the contents of the drawer.

Regarding claim 11-12, Peters and Dagle disclose all the limitations in claim 10 and Dagle further discloses tray has fourteen compartments, one of sensors 50, 52, 74, 76, 86, 88 being positioned in each of compartments, each of compartments being further subdivided by a medial partition positioned at a

spaced location from back wall of tray, each of sensors being located adjacent to media partition (fig. 1). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Dagle's plurality of sensors in Peters. Doing so would detect accurately the removal of the entire stack of bills by a teller in response to the demand of a bank robber thereby triggering an alarm to apprise security of the existence of the emergency so preventing unauthorized removal of the contents of the drawer as taught by Dagle (abstract).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2636

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dragan (US 5,281,952) discloses light-responsive enclosure alarm.

Gels et al. (US 5,512,877) discloses a currency removal sensor system.

Tucker (4,070,564) discloses anti-theft cash register.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel Previl whose telephone number is (571) 272-2971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 273 8300.

Art Unit: 2636

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Previl
Examiner
Art Unit 2636

DP
January 9, 2005.


JEFFERY HOFSSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600